

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Tileyah Williams	Team: Squad #6	CCRB Case #: 202106674	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Tuesday, 06/01/2021 12:00 AM, NA, 07/___/2021 12:00 AM, NA, 10/___/2021 12:00 AM	Location of Incident: Over the phone, Outside of § 87(2)(b) Outside of § 87(2)(b)	Precinct: 75	18 Mo. SOL 12/1/2022	EO SOL 12/1/2022	
Date/Time CV Reported Sat, 10/23/2021 1:54 PM	CV Reported At: IAB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Tue, 11/02/2021 10:01 AM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. PO Christian Salazar	22478	951195	075 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. PO Diana Grillo	21145	958655	075 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A. PO Christian Salazar	Abuse: On approximately June 1, 2021, Police Officer Christian Salazar made sexually suggestive remarks to § 87(2)(b)	
B. PO Christian Salazar	Abuse: On an unknown date, Police Officer Christian Salazar conducted a sexually motivated question of § 87(2)(b)	
C. PO Christian Salazar	Abuse: On an unknown date, Police Officer Christian Salazar propositioned § 87(2)(b)	
D. PO Christian Salazar	Abuse: On unknown dates, Police Officer Christian Salazar sent a sexually motivated photographs to § 87(2)(b)	

Case Summary

On October 23, 2021, § 87(2)(b) submitted this complaint via telephone with PO Diana Grillo of the 75th Precinct. On October 23, 2021, Sgt. Tara Mannix of the 75th Precinct forwarded the complaint to IAB via telephone on behalf of § 87(2)(b). It was received at the CCRB on November 2, 2021, via IAB log § 87(2)(b).

On May 10, 2021, at approximately 10:49 pm, officers from the 75th Precinct, including Police Officer Christian Salazar, responded to a gas station located at § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn, in response to a 911 call made by § 87(2)(b) for criminal mischief. PO Salazar served as a Spanish-speaking interpreter and the assailant was arrested. Later that day, PO Salazar texted § 87(2)(b) to ask how she was feeling. § 87(2)(b) responded back, and the texts continued. On approximately June 1, 2021, PO Salazar allegedly told § 87(2)(b) that she was very pretty and sent her sexual texts on various unknown dates (**Allegation A: Abuse of Authority**, § 87(2)(g)). On an unknown date in June, 2021, PO Salazar invited § 87(2)(b) to go for a ride in his personal vehicle, while he was in uniform and asked her to perform oral sex on him (**Allegations B : Abuse of Authority**, § 87(2)(g)). On an unknown date in October 2021, PO Salazar texted § 87(2)(b) requesting to see her and when she refused, he said that he would pay her for sex (**Allegation C: Abuse of Authority**, § 87(2)(g)). On various unknown dates, PO Salazar allegedly sent § 87(2)(b) photos of his genitals (**Allegation D: Abuse of Authority**, § 87(2)(g)).

The investigation did not obtain video footage regarding this incident. However, BWC footage was obtained for the May 10, 2021, showing PO Salazar responding to the gas station (**01 Board Review**).

Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: On approximately June 1, 2021, Police Officer Christian Salazar made sexually suggestive remarks to § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (B) Abuse of Authority: On an unknown date, Police Officer Christian Salazar conducted a sexually motivated question of § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (C) Abuse of Authority: On an unknown date, Police Officer Christian Salazar propositioned § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (D) Abuse of Authority: On unknown dates, Police Officer Christian Salazar sent sexually motivated photographs to § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) testified that on May 10, 2021, she called for officers to respond to § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn, after she was kidnapped and brought to that location (**02 Board Review**). Among the officers who responded was PO Salazar, who interpreted in Spanish for her. Later that day, PO Salazar texted her asking how she was doing and if she was okay. He continued to text her by phone and on Snapchat thereafter. On an unknown date in the summer of 2021, § 87(2)(b) was returning home and observed PO Salazar unannounced, not in uniform, in front of her residence. She had a conversation with PO Salazar, during which, he told her she was “very pretty.” A month later, sometime in the Summer of 2021, PO Salazar contacted § 87(2)(b) and stated he wanted to pick her up for a drive. PO Salazar picked her up in his personal vehicle while in uniform and drove § 87(2)(b) to the location where she had been held when kidnapped. § 87(2)(b) sat in the

back passenger seat. PO Salazar placed his firearm on the front passenger seat and told her to “suck it,” asking for oral sex. § 87(2)(b) denied engaging in sexual activity on this date and said that PO Salazar took her home when she asked. PO Salazar continued sending text messages to § 87(2)(b) saying that he wanted to see her, and that he would pay her **(03 Board Review)**. She believed that PO Salazar was offering to pay her for sex. On various unknown dates, PO Salazar sent photos of his genitals to § 87(2)(b). Though § 87(2)(b) told PO Salazar that she did not want to continue seeing him, he continued texting her. She did not ask PO Salazar to stop texting her and assumed that by ignoring his text messages that PO Salazar knew that she did not want to speak to him anymore. § 87(2)(b) did not have the messages that were sent via Snapchat because they were deleted.

PO Salazar’s BWC recording shows him arrive at § 87(2)(b)’s location on May 10, 2021 and assist her with Spanish-English interpretation **(01 Board Review)**.

§ 87(2)(b) provided the investigation with photos of some of the text messages (in Spanish) between herself and PO Salazar **(04, 05 Board Review)**. In one of the text chains, § 87(2)(b) tells PO Salazar that she is not interested, and he asks for, “Sola una vez más (only one more time).” **(04 Board Review)**. When § 87(2)(b) replies that she does not want to, PO Salazar says, “Yo te quiero mucho, te pago (I want you very much, I will pay).” Another photo shows a chain of text messages, where PO Salazar repeatedly asks to meet § 87(2)(b) talk to her and go to her home **(05 Board Review)**.

PO Salazar testified that after he interpreted for § 87(2)(b) on May 10, 2021, Sergeant Edward Thompson of the 75th Precinct instructed him and Police Officer Dustin Diaz of the 75th Precinct to escort § 87(2)(b) home to complete a domestic incident report **(06 Board Review)**. As PO Diaz and PO Salazar left § 87(2)(b)’s home, PO Salazar realized that PO Diaz did not give § 87(2)(b) the second part of her domestic incident report. PO Salazar used his department phone to call § 87(2)(b) and told her that PO Diaz would be arriving back at her home to have her complete the document. PO Salazar believed that he either got § 87(2)(b)’s phone number from the NYPD assignment or from the domestic incident report. The next day, May 11, 2021, PO Salazar called § 87(2)(b) to see if she was okay regarding the crime on the previous day. On that call, § 87(2)(b) provided PO Salazar with her Snapchat contact. PO Salazar did not remember what led § 87(2)(b) to providing him with her Snapchat username and did not remember asking § 87(2)(b) for her Snapchat. PO Salazar accepted § 87(2)(b)’s information and thought it to be innocent. PO Salazar messaged § 87(2)(b) on that same day, providing her with his Snapchat username. At some point, § 87(2)(b) started sending PO Salazar messages on Snapchat saying, “Hey” and “How are you.” These messages came within the same month of May 2021. PO Salazar said that from then, he and § 87(2)(b) became friends, and both had things going on in their lives that they vented about to each other.

PO Salazar did not know the dates which he communicated with § 87(2)(b) **(06 Board Review)**. He decided to remain in contact with § 87(2)(b) over Snapchat because they were friends. At some point, § 87(2)(b) asked to text PO Salazar on his personal phone, but he did not want to provide her with his number. Instead, he used a phone application with the word, “Text” in it. He was not sure what of the full name of the application. § 87(2)(b) sent the same messages to PO Salazar, greeting him and asking how he was doing.

After some time, the conversations between PO Salazar and § 87(2)(b) became sexual. He did not know how much time lapsed before this type of communication started. He did not remember exactly what the conversations were but knew that it passed greetings. He did not remember who initiated these sexual texts. This conversation was mostly through Snapchat. § 87(2)(b) also started sending PO Salazar photos of her exposed breasts. He sent headshot of himself to § 87(2)(b) but he was fully clothed in uniform. He did not send nude photos of himself and never sent § 87(2)(b) photos of his penis. PO Salazar sent § 87(2)(b) photos of himself because § 87(2)(b) asked for them. Since photos on Snapchat erase after a certain period of time, PO Salazar did not see any harm in sending the photos. He did not recall how long he and § 87(2)(b) texted with sexual content and did not know how many times their conversations were sexual in nature. He did not recall whether he also texted § 87(2)(b) while he was off duty. PO Salazar had these conversations with § 87(2)(b) to see how far he could push her. He wanted to know what else § 87(2)(b) would say to him because he is a visual person and reading and seeing these types of conversation from § 87(2)(b) turned him on. He did not recall § 87(2)(b) ever asking him to stop speaking in this way with her. § 87(2)(b) never indicated that she did not want to have these conversations with him.

When asked if PO Salazar ever met § 87(2)(b) in person, he explained that he ran into § 87(2)(b) twice when he responded to assignments that were in the vicinity of her home (**06 Board Review**). § 87(2)(b) came up to PO Salazar and said hi to him when she saw him. Their time was limited because he was on police duty. He did not know which day of the month or address of where these instances occurred. PO Salazar texted § 87(2)(b) once and told her that he was in the area, so that he could say hi to her, but she did not respond, and they did not meet on that day. PO Salazar denied ever driving § 87(2)(b) anywhere and she has never been in PO Salazar's personal vehicle. PO Salazar never arrived at § 87(2)(b)'s home unannounced. He called her very pretty through messages because she was a pretty woman and he wanted to give her a compliment. PO Salazar never asked § 87(2)(b) to ride in his personal vehicle. He never told § 87(2)(b) to "suck it," and has never otherwise asked § 87(2)(b) to perform oral sex on him. His relations with § 87(2)(b) never became physical and he did not ask § 87(2)(b) to pay her for sex. PO Salazar explained that he sent § 87(2)(b) a text on Snapchat asking to go to dinner with him. He sent her a separate message using the other texting app, informing her that he would pay for the dinner. This conversation was split between the two apps that they used. He was asking to go out with her as friends and catch up with her. He never offered § 87(2)(b) to pay her for sexual favors. PO Salazar texted, "Solo una vez más (only one more time)", to § 87(2)(b) to ask her to see her one more time because he wanted to say hi. He asked to go to § 87(2)(b)'s home but did not have a specific reason why. He said that it could have been because he had not seen her in a while and wanted to say hi. He never tried to have sex with § 87(2)(b). PO Salazar said that he noticed § 87(2)(b)'s texts dying down and believed that she may not have wanted to be his friend anymore, but he continued to text her because he thought that § 87(2)(b) was his friend. He ended his interaction with § 87(2)(b) in October 2021 because the Department told him to stop. He noted that he planned to stop because he realized that it was not the right thing to do.

Sergeant Kristopher Wood of IAB confirmed that he has not concluded his investigation regarding this case and the investigation was unable to obtain IAB's case file. He did note

that IAB considers § 87(2)(b) to be a high propensity domestic violence victim (when an individual's home is noted as having potential to be involved in future incidents of domestic violence) **(11 Board Review)**.

Engaging in a relationship beyond the scope of official duties with victim, confidential informants, witnesses, youth/young adults of NYPD programs while on or off duty is prohibited Administrative Guide 304-06 (07 Board Review). Officers are prohibited from dating, having romantic/sexual relationships, socializing, carpooling, unauthorized meetups, unauthorized home visits, contact via social media, forum, message, chat, or other sites and/or applications with the aforementioned groups.

§ 87(2)(b) testified that PO Salazar showed up to her home unannounced and, in their conversation, called her pretty. PO Salazar said that he never arrived at § 87(2)(b)'s home but admitted to texting her that she was pretty to compliment her, in addition to engaging in sexual conversations while on duty because it turned him on. PO Salazar also said that he requested to go to § 87(2)(b)'s home so that he could say hi to her. According to the Administrative Guide, PO Salazar committed misconduct when he continued texting § 87(2)(b) who was a considered a high-propensity domestic victim. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b) testified that PO Salazar asked her to perform oral sex on him while taking her for a ride, but PO Salazar denied asking this and said that he never took § 87(2)(b) for a car ride. The investigation was unable to gather any additional evidence to corroborate either version of events § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b) said that after she returned home from the car ride where PO Salazar requested oral sex, he asked to see her again. When she refused to see him, PO Salazar said that he would pay her, and § 87(2)(b) believed that he meant that he would pay her for sex. A photo of the text messages sent by § 87(2)(b) shows that PO Salazar asked for one more time and offered to pay, but it does not clarify what he wanted to pay for. PO Salazar said that when he said, "only one more time," he just wanted to see § 87(2)(b) again to say hi. Since both parties denied having physical relations, the investigation could not attribute the statement, "only one more time" to any other action. PO Salazar said that he wanted to pay for dinner with § 87(2)(b) and that he never tried to have sex with her. The investigation was unable to gather any additional evidence to corroborate either version of events § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b) said that PO Salazar texted her photos of his penis, but PO Salazar denied this. § 87(2)(b) did not provide any photo evidence of this, and the investigation does not have any evidence to corroborate § 87(2)(b)'s account of the incident. § 87(2)(g)

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- This is the first CCRB complaint to which § 87(2)(b) has been a party (**08 Board Review**).
- PO Salazar has been a member of service for ten years and has been a subject in seven CCRB complaints and 11 allegations, of which one was substantiated.
 - Case 201509514 involved substantiated allegations of force- physical and abuse of authority- stop against PO Salazar. The Board recommended Command Discipline B for the force allegation and the NYPD imposed Command Discipline B. The Board recommended DUP-No Discipline for the abuse of authority allegation and the NYPD imposed Command Discipline B. § 87(2)(b)

Mediation, Civil, and Criminal Histories

- This complaint was not suitable for mediation.
- As of August 26, 2022, the New York City Office of the Comptroller has no record of a Notice of Claim being filed regarding this incident (**09 Board Review**).

• § 87(2)(b)

Squad: 6

Investigator:	<u>Tileyah Williams</u>	<u>SI Williams</u>	<u>01/20/2023</u>
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Squad Leader:	<u>Jessica Pena</u>	<u>IM Jessica Peña</u>	<u>1/20/2023</u>
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Reviewer:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date